

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

Identifying data deleted to
prevent identity information
invasion of personal privacy

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS
425 Eye Street N.W.
ULLB, 3rd Floor
Washington, D.C. 20536

File: WAC 01 243 54251

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date: JAN 13 2003

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:

Petition: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Skilled Worker or Professional Pursuant to § 203(b)(3) of the
Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(3)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

PUBLIC COPY

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case.
Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. Id.

Any motion must be filed with the office that originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,
EXAMINATIONS

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, California Service Center, and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a computer parts and components wholesaler. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently as an assistant sales/marketing engineer-computer parts. As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by an individual labor certification approved by the Department of Labor. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary met the petitioner's qualifications for the position as stated in the labor certification.

Section 203(b)(3)(A)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(3)(A)(i), provides for the granting of preference classification to qualified immigrants who are capable, at the time of petitioning for classification under this paragraph, of performing skilled labor (requiring at least two years training or experience), not of a temporary or seasonal nature, for which qualified workers are not available in the United States.

Section 203(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act provides for the granting of preference classification to qualified immigrants who hold baccalaureate degrees and who are members of the professions.

A labor certification is an integral part of this petition, but the issuance of a labor certification does not mandate the approval of the relating petition. To be eligible for approval, a beneficiary must have all the training, education, and experience specified on the labor certification as of the petition's priority date. Matter of Wing's Tea House, 16 I&N Dec. 158 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977). Here, the petition's priority date is April 30, 1998.

The Application for Alien Employment Certification (Form ETA 750) indicated that the position of assistant sales/marketing engineer-computer parts required a Bachelor of Science degree in Electrical Engineering, and five years of experience in the job offered, or five years of experience in the related occupation of computer parts and components market.

The director determined that the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary had the required Bachelor's degree and denied the petition.

On appeal, counsel argues that the "beneficiary is holding a foreign equivalent degree falling under the definition of 'a foreign equivalent degree' in 8CFR.204.5(1)(3)(ii) as cited above."

The record contains an educational evaluation from the Foundation for International Services, Inc., which states that the beneficiary has the equivalent of one year of university-level credit from an accredited college or university in the United States, and has as

a result of his educational background and employment experiences (3 years of experience = 1 year of university-level credit), an educational background the equivalent of an individual with a bachelor's degree in Electronics Engineering Technology from an accredited university in the United States. The three year experience for one year of education rule used in the evaluation, however, is applicable to nonimmigrant H1B petitions, not immigrant petitions. The beneficiary is required to have a bachelor's degree on the Form ETA 750. The petitioner's actual minimum requirements could have been clarified or changed before the ETA 750 was certified by the Department of Labor. Since that was not done, the director's decision to deny the petition must be affirmed.

Doubt cast on any aspect of the petitioner's proof may lead to a reevaluation of the reliability and sufficiency of the remaining evidence offered in support of the visa petition. It is incumbent upon the petitioner to resolve any inconsistencies in the record by independent objective evidence, and attempts to explain or reconcile such inconsistencies, absent competent objective evidence pointing to where the truth, in fact, lies, will not suffice. Matter of Ho, 19 I&N Dec. 582 (BIA 1988).

The issue here is whether the beneficiary met all of the requirements stated by the petitioner in block #14 of the labor certification as of the day it was filed with the Department of Labor. The petitioner has not established that the beneficiary had a bachelor's degree on April 30, 1998. Therefore, the petition may not be approved.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1361. The petitioner has not sustained that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.